



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,145	03/26/2004	Yutaka Murakami	10873.0577USC1	8844

7590 01/12/2006
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. BOX 2902-0902
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRIAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2652

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,145

Applicant(s)

MURAKAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Brian E. Miller

Art Unit

2652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11,12 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11,12 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2652

This application is a CON of 09/673,919 and claims 11-12 and 28-31 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 11-12, 28-29, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi (US 6,084,747). (As per claims 11 & 12) Takahashi discloses a magnetic head device 1, as shown mainly in FIGs. 1, 3, 6, 16-17, including: a fastening member 3 having a cantilevered arm portion 32; a head main body 4 for applying a magnetic field to a recording medium 49; a suspension 6 which has a supporting portion 5 for connecting and supporting the head main body 4 on a side of a free end and has an elastically-deformable elastic portion 6b and a rigid body portion (unnumbered-thicker portion of element 6 which contacts element 33) that can be considered rigid; the arm portion 32 has a contacting portion 32b and wherein the contacting portion contacts the elastic portion so that the elastic portion is deformed elastically, e.g., compressed (see col. 17, lines 42-51), when the head main body is located away from the information recording medium (see FIGs. 16 & 17 and col. 18, lines 6-11); the arm portion having a second contacting portion 32a (claim 12) which contacts a second elastic portion (unnumbered-adjacent head attachment section 5) when the head main body is located from the information recording medium (as per claim 28); wherein the head main body includes a

Art Unit: 2652

magnetic pole core 10 (FIG. 3) which core opposes the recording medium and is substantially parallel to the recording surface when the head body is located away from the recording medium (as per claim 31); wherein the head main body 4 does not protrude beyond the fastening member 3 when the head main body is located away from the recording medium (as per claim 29)(see FIG. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi.

For a description of Takahashi, see the rejection, *supra*. Takahashi is silent as to a “third contacting portion” as set forth in claim 30. Providing a third contacting portion to the arm portion of Takahashi, would have been considered an obvious modification to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The motivation would have been: lacking any unobvious or unexpected results, having such a configuration would have provided a further limiting feature to prevent damage to the sensitive head suspension system, as would have been realized by a skilled artisan in view of the prior art of record. It has been held that a mere duplication of parts in an apparatus without any unobvious or unexpected results involves only routine skill in the art, to therefore duplicate or enhance the effects of the original structure; see also *St. Regis Paper Co. v Bemis Co.* 193 USPQ 8 (7th Cir. 1977).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A...Applicant asserts on page 4 of the "REMARKS" that "Takahashi does not disclose a magnetic head device including a contacting portion that contacts an elastic portion so that the elastic portion is deformed elastically when a head main body is located away from an information recording medium, as required by claim 11."

This is found unpersuasive by the Examiner. It is maintained that the regulating arm 32, and specifically elements 32a, and 32b of the regulating arm, would be readable on the first and second contact portion(s) as recited in the claim(s). It is also considered that Takahashi teaches that these members are "compressed against the head mounting portion" (see col. 17, lines 42-51 and col. 18, lines 22-26) such that this compression would be equivalent to the claimed "deformed elastically," as the degree of elastic deformation and/or difference in structure has not been particularly set forth in the claims. Furthermore, the inherent elasticity of thin synthetic resin material components, as the regulating arm of Takahashi is formed (see col. 14, lines 44-55) would be considered to enhance the Examiner's position.

B...Applicant reiterates the argument with respect to claim 12, however, Takahashi is considered to show a "second contact portion" similarly as discussed in (A...), above.

C...Claim 30 is generally argued for providing a third contact portion, however, this alone would not have been a patentable distinction over the applied art, as set forth in the rejection, supra.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E. Miller whose telephone number is (571) 272-7578. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:15am-4:45pm (and every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, A. L. Wellington can be reached on (571) 272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2652

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Miller", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brian E. Miller
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2652

BEM
January 9, 2006